arXiv:1702.02087v1 [q-fin.MF] 7 Feb 2017

CONDITIONAL DAVIS PRICING

KASPER LARSEN, HALIL METE SONER, AND GORDAN ŽITKOVIĆ

Abstract. We introduce the notion of a conditional Davis price and study its properties. Our ultimate goal is to use utility theory to price non-replicable contingent claims in the case when the investor's portfolio already contains a non-replicable component. We show that even in the simplest of settings - such as Samuelson's model - conditional Davis prices are typically not unique and form a non-trivial subinterval of the set of all no-arbitrage prices. Our main result characterizes this set and provides simple conditions under which its two endpoints can be effectively computed. We illustrate the theory with several examples.

February 8, 2017

1. Introduction

We consider an incomplete financial model with price dynamics modeled by a locally bounded semimartingale and we let φ denote a non-replicable payoff for some European claim. In many cases of interest, the interval of arbitrage-free prices corresponding to φ takes on an extreme form: its endpoints are given by the essential suprema and infima of φ. When risk-related considerations are taken into account, this interval can be substantially reduced, but, as we shall see, even the simplest of models produces a non-trivial interval.

There are several different ways of applying utility theory to price non-replicable payoffs, but they are all, in one way or another, based on equilibrium (demand vs. supply) considerations involving one or more risk-averse

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 91G10, 91G80; Secondary 60K35.
Journal of Economic Literature (JEL) Classification: C61, G11.
Key words and phrases. Incomplete markets, utility-maximization, unspanned endowment, local martingales, linearization, directional derivative.

The authors would like to thank Pietro Siorpaes, Mihai Sîrbu, and Kim Weston for numerous and helpful discussions. During the preparation of this work the first author has been supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1411809 (2014 - 2017), the second author has been supported by the Swiss National Foundation through the grant SNF 200021_153555 and by the Swiss Finance Institute, and the third author has been supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1107465 (2012 - 2017) and Grant No. DMS-1516165 (2015 - 2018). Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation (NSF).

agents. We refer the reader to the monographs [2] and [10] for further general information and thorough historical overviews. In contrast to the utility-based approach we insist on in this paper, several authors have used ad hoc methods to reduce the width of the interval of arbitrage free prices (see, e.g., [3] and its extension [1]) where so-called good deal bounds, based on the Hansen-Jagannathan bound for the Sharpe ratio, are used.

Our analysis focuses on the concept of marginal utility-based prices (also known as Davis prices) which were introduced by Mark Davis in [5]. For utility functions defined on the positive axis (such as power and logarithm), and without a random endowment, the authors of [12] show that Davis prices are unique for all bounded payoffs φ if and only if the dual utility optimizer $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a martingale measure (in which case, the unique Davis price of the payoff φ is given by $\mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}[\varphi]$). However, it has been known at least since the work [14] that there exist arbitrage-free models where the dual utility optimizers fail the martingale property; see also [16] for further examples of models satisfying the condition NFLVR (no free lunch with vanishing risk) where dual utility optimizers fail the martingale property. As a consequence, there are models for which there exist a bounded payoff φ with non-unique Davis prices (see [12] for an abstract construction of such a payoff φ).

In the view of the the above, one could restrict attention to financial models and utility functions which lead to martingale dual utility optimizers (see, e.g., the BMO-type condition used in [18]), or consider only payoffs φ with unique Davis prices (as done in [17]). In the current paper, however, we do not want to restrict ourselves to such situations because, as we exemplify in the next section, even Samuelson's simple geometric Brownian motion model with logarithmic or power utilities can easily produce non-unique Davis prices when a non-replicable random endowment B is present

We are, therefore, interested in *conditional* Davis prices, i.e., the general case where both the investor's random endowment $B \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ (i.e., the illiquid component of the portfolio) and the claim $\varphi \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ to be priced are arbitrary and non-replicable. The starting point of our analysis is [4], whose authors extended the duality theory developed in [16] to include finitely-additive measures in the dual utility problem's domain. Such a setting is not only natural for utility-maximization problems with random endowments, but, as we show in the present paper, allows for a simple characterization of conditional Davis prices.

The main contributions of the present paper in this context are the following:

(1) For a non-replicable endowment $B \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$, we show that the interval of conditional Davis prices for the payoff $\varphi \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ is given by the set of all $\langle \varphi, \hat{\mathbb{Q}} \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$, when $\hat{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathrm{ba}(\mathbb{P})$ ranges through the set of finitely-additive dual optimizers of the associated utility-maximization problem (as introduced in [4]). Here $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the dual pairing between $\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ and its dual $\mathrm{ba}(\mathbb{P}) := (\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P}))'$. This

representation also allows us to give simplified proofs of partial extensions of some of the results of [12]. For example, we give a generic non-uniqueness result for conditional Davis prices using the Vitali-Hahn-Sachs theorem, and show that the these prices are unique for contingent claims dominated by a multiple of the optimal terminal wealth.

(2) It is well-known that Davis prices are linked to derivatives of the primal utility value function and we study the directional derivative when the value function is seen as a function of the random endowment B. We show that under a mild growth condition on the utility function around 0 such a derivative can be characterized as the value of a certain linear stochastic control problem. Furthermore, we show by means of an example that C^1-smoothness can fail even in the "constant direction". This implies, in particular, that the value function (parameterized by the investor's initial wealth) of a utility maximization problem with a non-replicable random endowment may fail to be differentiable everywhere (unlike the case of a replicable random endowment).

(3) Under additional assumptions on the endowment $B \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ and the payoff $\varphi \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ (based on the concept of unique superreplicability from [19]) we solve the above mentioned linear stochastic control problem explicitly. This gives us formulas for the two endpoints describing the interval of conditional Davis prices. As an offshoot, we show additionally that the primal utility value function mentioned in (2) above is smooth whenever B is uniquely superreplicable.

2. Illustrative examples

Before we state and prove our general results we will provide two examples both set in the incomplete Brownian setting. We let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space supporting two independent Brownian motions (Z, W) and we let $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ be their augmented filtration up to some maturity $T > 0$. The set of all pathwise-square-integrable predictable processes is denoted by $\mathcal{L}^2$. The space finitely-additive measures which are $\mathbb{P}$-absolutely continuous is denoted $\mathrm{ba}(\mathbb{P})$ so that $\mathrm{ba}(\mathbb{P}) = \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})'$.

In both examples the dual utility optimizer is a strict local martingale which implies that the interval of conditional Davis prices may degenerate (see Section 4. below for the definition of conditional Davis prices). In fact, we will give closed-form expressions for the entire interval of Davis prices. In both examples, we consider an unspanned claim paying out $\varphi(W_T)$ at time T, where $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a non-constant, bounded, and continuous function. The stock price dynamics are

$$dS_t = S_t\sigma_t\big(\lambda_t dt + dZ_t\big), \quad S_0 > 0.$$

Because the processes $\sigma, \lambda \in \mathcal{L}^2$ can depend on both Z and W, this setting is incomplete.

2.1. **Example 1.** We consider the counterexample setting of [8] where the stock price dynamics are given by

$$dS_t = S_t\big(\lambda_t dt + dZ_t\big), \quad S_0 > 0,$$

and are such that the minimal martingale density

$$\mathcal{E}(-\lambda \cdot Z)_t := e^{-\int_0^t \lambda_u dZ_u - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \lambda_u^2 du}, \quad t \in [0,T],$$

fails the martingale property even though the set $\mathcal{M}$ of equivalent local martingale measures is non-empty. As a consequence, Example 5.1 in [16] shows that the log-investor's dual utility optimizer $\hat{Y}_t := \hat{Y}_0 \mathcal{E}(-\lambda \cdot Z)_t$ is a strict local martingale.

In this setting, the interval of arbitrage-free prices for the time $T > 0$ payoff $\varphi(W_T)$ is given by $[\underline{\varphi}, \overline{\varphi}]$ where

$$\underline{\varphi} := \inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \varphi(a), \quad \overline{\varphi} := \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \varphi(a). \tag{2.1}$$

Our main Theorem 7.2 below shows that the interval of Davis' prices for the claim paying out $\varphi(W_T)$ at $T > 0$ for the log-investor is given by $[\underline{p}, \overline{p}]$ where

$$\underline{p} := \tfrac{1}{\hat{Y}_0}\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}_T(\varphi - \underline{\varphi})] + \underline{\varphi}, \quad \overline{p} := \overline{\varphi} - \tfrac{1}{\hat{Y}_0}\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}_T(\overline{\varphi} - \varphi)].$$

Therefore,

$$\overline{p} - \underline{p} = (\overline{\varphi} - \underline{\varphi})(1 - \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}_T]/\hat{Y}_0) > 0,$$

as soon as the function φ is not constant.

2.2. **Example 2.** We consider the Samuelson setting used in Section 2 in [19] where the stock price dynamics are given by

$$dS_t = S_t\big(\mu dt + \sigma dZ_t\big), \quad S_0 > 0,$$

for two strictly positive constants μ and σ. Let $U(b) := \frac{b^p}{p}$ for $p < 1$ and $b > 0$, and let $\varphi_0 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a non-constant, bounded, and continuous function. The investor receives the random endowment $x + \varphi_0(W_T)$ at time $T > 0$. We assume $x \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $x + \underline{\varphi}(0) > 0$ where

$$\underline{\varphi}(\varepsilon) := \inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \Big(\varphi_0(a) + \varepsilon\varphi(a)\Big), \quad \overline{\varphi}(\varepsilon) := \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \Big(\varepsilon\varphi(a) - \varphi_0(a)\Big), \quad \varepsilon \geq 0.$$

In this setting, the interval of arbitrage-free prices for the claim with time $T > 0$ payoff $\varphi(W_T)$ is given by $[\underline{\varphi}, \overline{\varphi}]$ where the constants $\underline{\varphi}$ and $\overline{\varphi}$ are defined by (2.1). Furthermore, we know from Proposition 2.4 in [19] that the dual optimizer $\hat{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathrm{ba}(\mathbb{P})$ has a non-trivial singular part in the Yosida-Hewitt decomposition $\hat{\mathbb{Q}} = \hat{\mathbb{Q}}^r + \hat{\mathbb{Q}}^s$ for small enough values of x. This

loss-of-mass property for $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}^r$ can be partially quantified as follows: Theorem 3.7 in [11] and Proposition 3.2 in [21] allow us to write $\frac{d\hat{\mathbb{Q}}^r}{d\mathbb{P}} = \hat{Y}_T$ where

$$d\hat{Y}_t = -\hat{Y}_t\big(\tfrac{\mu}{\sigma}dZ_t + \hat{\nu}_t dW_t\big), \quad \hat{Y}_0 > 0,$$

for some process $\hat{\nu} \in \mathcal{L}^2$. The presence of the non-trivial singular part $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}^s$ implies that $\hat{Y}$ is a strict local martingale, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}_T] < \hat{Y}_0$. Consequently, conditional Davis prices may not be unique. Indeed, Theorem 7.2 below shows that the interval of conditional Davis prices for the payoff $\varphi(W_T)$ is given by $[\underline{p}, \overline{p}]$ where

$$\underline{p} := \tfrac{1}{\hat{Y}_0}\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{Y}_T\big(\varphi(W_T) - \underline{\varphi}'(0+)\big)\right] + \underline{\varphi}'(0+),$$
$$\overline{p} := \overline{\varphi}'(0+) - \tfrac{1}{\hat{Y}_0}\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{Y}_T\big(\overline{\varphi}'(0+) - \varphi(W_T)\big)\right].$$

3. The setup and assumptions

3.1. **The market model.** Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space which satisfies the usual conditions, and let $\{S_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ be a locally bounded semimartingale. $L(S)$ denotes the set of all predictable S-integrable processes and $\mathcal{M}$ denotes the set of all $\mathbb{P}$-equivalent countably-additive probability measures $\mathbb{Q}$ on $\mathcal{F}$ for which S is a $\mathbb{Q}$-local martingale.

Standing Assumption 3.1 (NFLVR)**.** $\mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$. □

3.2. **Gains and admissibility.** The investor's gains process has the following dynamics

$$(\pi \cdot S)_t := \int_0^t \pi_u \, dS_u, \quad t \in [0,T], \tag{3.1}$$

for some $\pi \in L(S)$. We call $\pi \in L(S)$ admissible if the gains process is uniformly lower bounded by a constant in which case we write $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$. The set of terminal outcomes is denoted by $\mathcal{K}$, i.e., we define

$$\mathcal{K} := \{(\pi \cdot S)_T \,:\, \pi \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

3.3. **The primal problem.** Let U be a utility function on $(0,\infty)$, i.e., U is strictly concave, strictly increasing, and continuously differentiable with $U'(0+) = +\infty$ and $U'(+\infty) = 0$. When necessary, we extend the domain of U to $\mathbb{R}$ by setting $U(x) = -\infty$ for $x < 0$ and $U(0) = \inf_{x>0} U(x)$. Finally, U is said to be reasonably elastic (as defined in [16]) if

$$\limsup_{x\to\infty} \tfrac{xU'(x)}{U(x)} < 1.$$

Even though we need it for some of our results, we do not impose the condition of reasonable elasticity from the start.

Given a random variable $B \in \mathbb{L}^\infty_{++} := \cup_{x>0}(x + \mathbb{L}^\infty_+)$ we define

$$\mathfrak{U}(B) := \sup_{X\in\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E}\Big[U\Big(B + X\Big)\Big] \tag{3.2}$$

with the convention that $\mathbb{E}[U(B+X)] = -\infty$ if $\mathbb{E}[U(B+X)^-] = +\infty$. Because $\mathfrak{U}(B) \geq U(\operatorname{essinf} B) > -\infty$, $\mathfrak{U}$ is $(-\infty,\infty]$-valued on $\mathbb{L}^\infty_{++}$.

3.4. **The dual utility maximization problem.** The set of equivalent local martingale measures $\mathcal{M}$ can be identified - via Radon-Nikodym derivatives with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ - with a subset of $\mathbb{L}^1_+(\mathbb{P})$ and embedded, naturally, into $\mathrm{ba}(\mathbb{P}) := \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})^* \supseteq \mathbb{L}^1(\mathbb{P})$. We define $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^*$ as the weak*-closure of $\mathcal{M}$ and we define $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathrm{ba}_+(\mathbb{P})$ as the family of all $y\mathbb{Q}$ where $y \in [0,\infty)$ and $\mathbb{Q} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}^*$. We can then define the dual utility functional by

$$\mathbb{V}_B(\mu) := \sup_{X \in \mathbb{L}^\infty} \Big(\mathbb{E}[U(B+X)] - \langle \mu, X \rangle \Big), \quad \mu \in \mathrm{ba}(\mathbb{P}).$$

In particular, $\mathbb{V}_B$ is convex, lower weak*-semicontinuous on $\mathrm{ba}(\mathbb{P})$ and bounded from below by $\mathbb{E}[U(B)] \in \mathbb{R}$. For the reminder of the paper we impose a properness assumption. While not the weakest possible in our setting, this assumption allows us to deal swiftly, and yet with a minimal loss of generality, with several technical points that are not central to the message of the paper:

Standing Assumption 3.2 (Properness)**.** There exist $y_0 \in (0,\infty)$ and $\mathbb{Q}_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mu_0 := y_0\mathbb{Q}_0$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{V}_B(\mu_0) < \infty. \tag{3.3}$$

Thanks to a minimal modification of Lemma 2.1 on p. 138 in [22] and the discussion before it, $\mathbb{V}_B$ admits the following representation

$$\mathbb{V}_B(\mu) = \mathbb{E}\left[V\left(\tfrac{d\mu^r}{d\mathbb{P}} \right) \right] + \langle \mu, B \rangle, \quad \mu \in \mathcal{D}, \tag{3.4}$$

where V is the dual utility function (strictly convex) defined by

$$V(y) := \sup_{x>0} \Big(U(x) - xy \Big), \quad y > 0.$$

Consequently, Fenchel's inequality and (3.3) ensure that the primal value function $\mathfrak{U}$ satisfies $\mathfrak{U}(B) < \infty$ for all $B \in \mathbb{L}^\infty_{++}$. Furthermore, (3.3) also ensures that the corresponding dual value function defined by

$$\mathfrak{V}(B) := \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{V}_B(\mu), \quad B \in \mathbb{L}^\infty_{++}, \tag{3.5}$$

is finitely valued. For $B \in \mathbb{L}^\infty_{++}$ we let $\hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$ denote the set of all minimizers, i.e., all those $\mu \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathfrak{V}(B) = \mathbb{V}_B(\mu)$.

The next result collects some basic facts we will need in the following sections:

Lemma 3.3. *For each $B \in \mathbb{L}^\infty_{++}$, the set $\hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$ is a nonempty weak*-compact subset of* $\mathrm{ba}(\mathbb{P})$ *and there exists a nonnegative random variable $\hat{Y} = \hat{Y}(B)$ such that $\mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} > 0] > 0$ and*

$$\hat{Y} = \tfrac{d\mu^r}{d\mathbb{P}} \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B).$$

Furthermore, the strong duality $\mathfrak{U}(B) = \mathfrak{V}(B)$ holds for all $B \in \mathbb{L}^\infty_{++}$.

Proof. Let $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a minimizing sequence for $\mathbb{V}_B$ of the form

$$\mu_n = y_n\mathbb{Q}_n \text{ where } \mathbb{Q}_n \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}^* \text{ and } \{y_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq [0,\infty).$$

To see that $\{y_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, we note that (3.3) produces the finite upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{V}_B(\mu_0) &\geq \limsup_n \mathbb{E}[V(y_n\tfrac{d\mathbb{Q}_n^r}{d\mathbb{P}})] + y_n\langle\mathbb{Q}_n, B\rangle\\ &\geq \limsup_n V(y_n) + y_n \operatorname{essinf} B.\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from (3.4) and the minimizing property of the sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ whereas the last inequality follows from the non-increasing property of V and Jensen's inequality. Because $V'(\infty) = 0$ and essinf $B > 0$ the boundedness property of $\{y_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ follows.

Because the finitely-additive probabilities $\{\mathbb{Q}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ belong to the weak*-compact set $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^*$ we can conclude that $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ admits a weak*-convergent subnet μ_α such that $\mu_\alpha \to \mu$, for some $\mu \in \mathcal{D}$. The functional $\mathbb{V}_B$ is lower semicontinuous and we get

$$\mathfrak{V}(B) = \lim_\alpha \mathbb{V}_B(\mu_\alpha) \geq \mathbb{V}_B(\mu).$$

Therefore, μ is a minimizer over $\mathcal{D}$ and we have $\hat{\mathcal{D}}(B) \neq \emptyset$.

Next, we show that all $\mu \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$ have the same regular part. For that, suppose that $\mu_1^r \neq \mu_2^r$. Then, $\mu = \frac{1}{2}\mu_1 + \frac{1}{2}\mu_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and by (3.4) we have

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{V}_B(\mu_1) + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{V}_B(\mu_2) = \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[V(\tfrac{d\mu_1^r}{d\mathbb{P}})\right] + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[V(\tfrac{d\mu_2^r}{d\mathbb{P}})\right] + \langle\mu, B\rangle > \mathbb{V}_B(\mu),$$

by the strict convexity of V. However, this is in contradiction with the minimality of μ_1 and μ_2.

To see that $\hat{Y} \neq 0$ we argue by contradiction and suppose that $\mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} = 0] = 1$. In that case $V(0) < \infty$ and, so, thanks to Jensen's inequality, we have $\mathbb{V}_B(\mu) < \infty$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{D}$. In particular, we have for some $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\hat{\mu} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$

$$\mathbb{V}_B(\mu^\varepsilon) < \infty, \quad \text{where} \quad \mu_\varepsilon := \varepsilon\mathbb{Q} + (1-\varepsilon)\hat{\mu}, \quad \varepsilon \in [0,1].$$

Because the regular-part functional is additive we have

$$\mu_\varepsilon^r = \varepsilon\mathbb{Q} + (1-\varepsilon)\hat{\mu}^r = \varepsilon\mathbb{Q}.$$

Therefore, $\hat{\mu}$'s minimality produces

$$\mathbb{E}[V(\varepsilon\tfrac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}})] + \langle\mu_\varepsilon, B\rangle = \mathbb{V}_B(\mu_\varepsilon) \geq \mathbb{V}_B(\hat{\mu}) = V(0) + \langle\hat{\mu}, B\rangle.$$

Fatou's lemma then implies

$$\langle\mathbb{Q} - \hat{\mu}, B\rangle \geq \liminf_{\varepsilon\searrow 0} \tfrac{1}{\epsilon}\Big(V(0) - \mathbb{E}\left[V\left(\varepsilon\tfrac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}\right)\right]\Big) = -V'(0) = +\infty.$$

This is a contradiction because $B \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ ensures that the left-hand-side is finite.

From the above, we know that $\hat{\mu}(\Omega)$ is uniformly bounded over $\hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$. Therefore, the weak*-closed set $\hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$ is norm bounded and the compactness property of $\hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$ follows from Banach-Alaoglu's theorem.

Finally, to establish the strong duality property, we define the nested sequence of weak*-compact dual sets

$$\mathcal{D}_n := \{\mu \in \mathcal{D} : ||\mu|| \leq n\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

as well as the primal set

$$\mathcal{C} := (\mathcal{K} - \mathbb{L}^0_+) \cap \mathbb{L}^\infty = \{X \in \mathbb{L}^\infty \,:\, \langle \mathbb{Q}, X\rangle \leq 0 \text{ for all } \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

For a proof of the last identity see, e.g., Corollary 3.4(1) in [20]. As a consequence, we have the following identity for $X \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\mu\in\mathcal{D}_n} \langle \mu, X\rangle = \begin{cases} 0, & X \in \mathcal{C}, \\ +\infty, & X \notin \mathcal{C}. \end{cases}$$

The minimax theorem (see, e.g., Theorem 2.10.2, p. 144 in [24]) can then be used to produce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{V}(B) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{D}_n} \sup_{X\in\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})} \Big(\mathbb{E}[U(X+B)] - \langle \mu, X\rangle\Big) \\ &= \sup_{X\in\mathcal{C}} \mathbb{E}[U(X+B)]. \end{aligned}$$

The monotone convergence theorem ensures that this expression equals the primal value function $\mathfrak{U}(B)$. □

4. Davis prices and their characterization

Definition 4.1. For $B \in \mathbb{L}^\infty_{++}$, a random variable $R \in \mathbb{L}^\infty$ is said to be B-**irrelevant**, denoted by $R \in \mathcal{I}(B)$, if

$$\mathfrak{U}(B) \geq \mathfrak{U}(B + \varepsilon R) \text{ for all } \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.1}$$

Remark 4.2. The function $\mathfrak{U}$ finite-valued at B, as well as in a $\mathbb{L}^\infty$-open ball around B. Therefore, both sides of (4.1) are real-valued for small enough ε. Thanks for the concavity of $\mathfrak{U}$, the right hand side of (4.1) may only take the negative infinite value, for larger values of ε. Therefore, for $R \in \mathcal{I}(B)$, it is enough to check (4.1) only for ε in a neighborhood of 0.

Lemma 4.3. *$\mathcal{I}(B)$ is a nonempty, weak* closed linear subspace in $\mathbb{L}^\infty$.*

Proof. The function $\mathfrak{U}$ is concave at B, so $\mathcal{I}(B)$ is the set of those directions R with the property that the directional derivative of $\mathfrak{U}$ in directions R and $-R$ are nonpositive. In other words, we have

$$\sup_{\mu\in\partial\mathfrak{U}(B)} \langle R, \mu\rangle \leq 0 \text{ and } \sup_{\mu\in\partial\mathfrak{U}(B)} -\langle R, \mu\rangle \leq 0,$$

where $\partial\mathfrak{U}(B) \subseteq \mathrm{ba}(\mathbb{P})$ is the superdifferential of $\mathfrak{U}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{I}(B)$ is the annihilator of $\partial\mathfrak{U}(B)$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{I}(B) = \{R \in \mathbb{L}^\infty \,:\, \langle \mu, R\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } \mu \in \partial\mathfrak{U}(B)\},$$

which implies the statement. □

Definition 4.4. A number $p \in \mathbb{R}$ is said to be a B-**marginal utility price** (or a B-**conditional Davis price** and simply a **conditional Davis price** if B is clear from the context) for $\varphi \in \mathbb{L}^\infty$ if $\varphi - p$ is B-irrelevant. The set of all B-conditional Davis prices of φ is denoted by $P(\varphi|B)$.

4.1. **A dual characterization.** The dual characterization of the set of conditional Davis prices in Theorem 4.6 below rests on the following, simple, lemma:

Lemma 4.5. *A random variable $R \in \mathbb{L}^\infty$ is B-irrelevant if and only if*

$$\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{D}} \Big(\mathbb{V}_B(\mu) + |\langle \mu, R\rangle|\Big) = \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{V}_B(\mu). \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Because $\mathcal{I}(B)$ is a vector space, we can scale R so that, without loss generality, we can assume that $B \pm R \in \mathbb{L}^\infty_{++}$. Then, by the minimax theorem (see Theorem 2.10.2, p. 144 in [24]), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{D}} \Big(\mathbb{V}_B(\mu) + |\langle \mu, R\rangle|\Big) &= \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{D}} \sup_{|\varepsilon|\le 1} \Big(\mathbb{V}_B(\mu) + \varepsilon\langle \mu, R\rangle\Big) \\ &= \sup_{|\varepsilon|\le 1} \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{D}} \Big(\mathbb{V}_B(\mu) + \varepsilon\langle \mu, R\rangle\Big) = \sup_{|\varepsilon|\le 1} \mathfrak{U}(B + \varepsilon R).\end{aligned}$$

The same equality with $R = 0$, implies that (4.2) is equivalent to

$$\mathfrak{U}(B) = \sup_{|\varepsilon|\le 1} \mathfrak{U}(B + \varepsilon R)$$

which is, in turn, equivalent to $R \in \mathcal{I}(B)$. □

By Lemma 3.3, we have $\mu(\Omega) > 0$ for each $\mu \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$. Therefore, the family

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_0(B) := \{\tfrac{1}{\mu(\Omega)}\mu \,:\, \mu \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)\} \tag{4.3}$$

is a well-defined nonempty family of finitely-additive probabilities. We now have everything set up for our main characterization of conditional Davis prices:

Theorem 4.6. *For $\varphi \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ the following two statements are equivalent*

1. *$p \in P(\varphi|B)$, i.e., p is a B-conditional Davis price of φ.*
2. *$p = \langle \mathbb{Q}, \varphi\rangle$, for some $\mathbb{Q} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_0(B)$.*

In particular, $P(\varphi|B)$ is a nonempty compact subinterval of $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. (1) ⇒ (2): The first part of the proof of Lemma 3.3 applies to the functional $\mu \mapsto \mathbb{V}_B(\mu) + |\langle \mu, \varphi - p\rangle|$, and we can conclude that it admits a minimizer $\hat{\mu}$. By Lemma 4.5, the same $\hat{\mu}$ must minimize the functional $\mu \mapsto \mathbb{V}_B(\mu)$, as well, and, so, $\hat{\mu} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$ and $\langle \hat{\mu}, \varphi - p\rangle = 0$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1)**:** Suppose that p is such that $\langle \mu^*, \varphi - p\rangle = 0$, for some $\mu^* \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_0(B)$. Then, for any μ, we have

$$\mathbb{V}_B(\mu^*) + |\langle \mu^*, \varphi - p\rangle| = \mathbb{V}_B(\mu^*) \leq \mathbb{V}_B(\mu) \leq \mathbb{V}_B(\mu) + |\langle \mu, \varphi - p\rangle|,$$

and Lemma 4.5 can be used.

Finally, Lemma 3.3 ensures that $\hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$ is weak*-compact and the last claim follows. □

4.2. **Some consequences.** A reinterpretation in the setting of portfolios with convex constraints leads to the following dual characterization:

Corollary 4.7. *Suppose that U is reasonably elastic. Then, for each constant $c \geq 0$ and each $R \in \mathbb{L}^\infty$ we have*

$$\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{D}} \Big(\mathbb{V}_B(\mu) + c|\langle \mu, R\rangle|\Big) = \inf_{y\geq 0, \mathbb{Q}\in\mathcal{M}} \Big(\mathbb{V}_B(y\mathbb{Q}) + c|\langle y\mathbb{Q}, R\rangle|\Big).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} := (\mathcal{K} - \mathbb{L}^0_+) \cap \mathbb{L}^\infty$ and let $\mathcal{C}'$ be the family of all random variables $X' \in \mathbb{L}^\infty$ of the form

$$X' = B + X + \varepsilon R, \text{ where } X \in \mathcal{C}, \quad \varepsilon \in [-c, c].$$

The support function $\alpha_{\mathcal{C}'}$ for the set $\mathcal{C}'$ is then given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{\mathcal{C}'}(\mu) &= \sup_{X'\in\mathcal{C}'} \langle \mu, X\rangle \\
&= \langle \mu, B\rangle + \sup_{X\in\mathcal{C},\ \varepsilon\in[-c,c]} \Big(\langle \mu, X\rangle + \varepsilon\langle \mu, R\rangle\Big) \\
&= \langle \mu, B\rangle + c|\langle \mu, R\rangle| + \begin{cases} 0, & \mu \in \mathcal{D}, \\ +\infty, & \mu \notin \mathcal{D}. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{D}} \Big(\mathbb{V}_B(\mu) + c|\langle \mu, R\rangle|\Big) = \inf_{\mu\in \mathrm{ba}(\mathbb{P})} \Big(\mathbb{V}_0(\mu) + \alpha_{\mathcal{C}'}(\mu)\Big). \tag{4.4}$$

Moreover, the set $\mathcal{C}$ is weak*-closed by Theorem 4.2 in [6]; hence, so is $\mathcal{C}'$. Hence, the assumptions of Proposition 3.14, p. 686 of [20] are satisfied (via Corollary 3.4, p. 679 in [20]) and, so, the infimum on the right-hand side of (4.4) can be replaced by an infimum over σ-additive measures. □

Our next two consequences of Theorem 4.6 provide a partial generalization and an alternative method of proof for Theorem 3.1, p. 206 in [12].

Proposition 4.8. *Suppose that U is reasonably elastic and that the dual problem* (3.5) *admits a non-σ-additive optimizer. Then there exists $A \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\varphi = \mathbf{1}_A$ has multiple B-conditional Davis prices.*

Proof. Let $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a minimizing sequence for the problem $\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{V}_B(\mu)$. By Corollary 4.7 we can assume that each μ is countably additive. Moreover, the argument of Lemma 3.3 guarantees that the sequence $\{\mu(\Omega)_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. Therefore, $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ belongs to a weak*-compact subset of $\mathrm{ba}(\mathbb{P})$.

By extracting a further subsequence, we may assume that the sequence of total masses $\mu_n(\Omega)$ converges towards a positive constant $y > 0$ (Lemma 3.3 ensures that $y \neq 0$).

We suppose first that $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is not weak*-convergent. Then, two of its convergent subnets will have different limits, and both of these will be elements of $\hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$ with the same total mass $y > 0$. Hence, the set $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_0(B)$ of (4.3) is not a singleton, and, by Corollary 4.6, there exists $\varphi = \mathbf{1}_A$, with $A \in \mathcal{F}$, with two different conditional Davis prices.

On the other hand, suppose that $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\hat{\mu}$ in the weak*-sense. Then we have $\hat{\mu} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$. Furthermore, by the Vitali-Hahn-Sachs theorem (see [9], Corollary 8 on p.159) the limit $\hat{\mu}$ is countably additive. Hence, the set $\hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$ will have at least two different elements - one countably additive and one not. Then a random variable $\varphi = \mathbf{1}_A$ with two different conditional Davis prices can be constructed as above. □

The next consequence of Theorem 4.6 gives a sufficient condition (analogous to that of Theorem 3.1 on p. 206 of [12]) for the uniqueness of conditional Davis prices. Before we state it, we recall that, under the condition of reasonable elasticity, [4] show there exists a process $\hat{\pi} \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\hat{X} := (\hat{\pi} \cdot S)_T + B$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[U(\hat{X})] = \mathfrak{U}(B) \text{ and } U'(\hat{X}) = \frac{d\hat{\mu}^r}{d\mathbb{P}}, \tag{4.5}$$

where $\hat{\mu} \in \hat{D}(B)$. The random variable $\hat{X}$ is $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. unique with this property.

Corollary 4.9. *Suppose U is reasonably elastic and that $|\varphi| \leq c\hat{X}$, for some constant $c \geq 0$, where $\hat{X}$ is as in (4.5). Then the set $P(\varphi|B)$ of B-conditional Davis prices for $\varphi \in \mathbb{L}^\infty$ is a singleton.*

Proof. In view of Lemma 3.3 and Theorem 4.6, it will be enough to show that $\langle \hat{\mu}^s, \hat{X} \rangle = 0$, for each $\hat{\mu} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$. This, in turn, follows directly from the first part of Equation (4.7) in [4]. □

5. Directional derivatives of the primal value function

Our next task is to study directional differentiability of the primal utility-maximization value function $\mathfrak{U}$ defined by (3.2). Its relevance in the context of Davis pricing has been noted by several authors (including Davis in [5]), and we use the obtained results in the later sections to give a workable characterization of the interval of conditional Davis prices. First we show, by means of an example, that smoothness - even in the most "benign" directions - cannot be expected in general. Then we give a characterization of the directional derivative in terms of a linear control problem. We hope that both our counterexample and the later characterization hold some independent interest outside of the context of Davis pricing.

5.1. **An example of nonsmoothness.** Our next example shows that the set $\hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$ of dual minimizers may contain measures with different total masses. In other words, $\hat{\mu}(\Omega)$ may not be constant over $\hat{\mu} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$. Consequently, $\mathfrak{U}$ may fail to be differentiable even in "constant directions" in the sense that $\varepsilon \to \mathfrak{U}(B + \varepsilon)$ may fail to be differentiable at $\varepsilon := 0$. Once we introduce the concept of unique superreplicability in the next section, we will see how it can be used to regain differentiability in certain cases of interest.

For simplicity and concreteness, we base the example on Example 5.1' in [16], and use the following notation and conventions: All random variables X will be defined on the sample space $\Omega := \mathbb{N}_0$, and we write X_n for $X(\{n\})$. Countably-additive measures are identified with sequences in ℓ^1_+ and for $\mathbb{Q} = (q_n) \in \ell^1_+$ we write $\langle \mathbb{Q}, X \rangle$ for $\sum q_n X_n$ whenever $X = (X_n) \in \ell^\infty$.

Example 5.1. We start by recalling the elements of (a special case of) the one period Example 5.1' in [16] where $\Omega := \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\mathbb{P} = (p_n)$ with

$$p_0 := \tfrac{3}{4}, \quad p_n := \tfrac{2^{-n}}{4} \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The one-period stock-price increment $\Delta S = (\Delta S_n)$ is defined as follows

$$\Delta S_0 := 1 \text{ and } \Delta S_n := \tfrac{1-n}{n} \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

With $U := \log$, the primal problem is defined by

$$u(x) := \sup_{\pi \in [-x,x]} \mathbb{E}[U(x + \pi \Delta S)], \quad x > 0.$$

Let $\mathcal{Q}$ denote the set of all finite martingale measures, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{Q} := \{\mathbb{Q} \in \ell^1_+ \,:\, \langle \mathbb{Q}, \Delta S \rangle = 0\},$$

and let $\mathcal{M} := \{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q} \,:\, \langle \mathbb{Q}, 1 \rangle = 1\}$. Because $V(y) = -1 - \log(y)$, the dual problem is given by

$$v(y) := \inf_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E}[V(y \tfrac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}})] = V(y) + v^*, \text{ where } v^* := \inf_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E}[-\log(\tfrac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}})].$$

We will start by showing that no minimizing sequence $(\mathbb{Q}^N)_N \subset \mathcal{M}$ for v^* (equivalently, for $v(y)$) can be weakly convergent in the sense that $\langle \mathbb{Q}^N, f \rangle$ cannot converge for all test functions $f \in \ell^\infty$. It is a consequence of the Vitali-Hahn-Sachs Theorem (see, e.g., Corollary 8, p.159 in [9]) that ℓ^1 is weakly sequentially complete, so any weakly convergent sequence is necessarily weakly convergent in ℓ^1. Therefore, any weak limit of any minimizing sequence $(\mathbb{Q}^N)_N$ must also belong to $\mathcal{M}$ and is, therefore, a minimizer for v^*. However, this would contradict the strict supermartingale property of the dual log-optimizer shown in Example 5.1' in [16].

As a consequence of the above, for a given minimizing sequence $(\mathbb{Q}^N)_N$, there exists a random variable $H \in \ell^\infty$ such that

$$\langle \mathbb{Q}^N, H \rangle \text{ does not converge in } \mathbb{R} \text{ as } N \to \infty. \tag{5.1}$$

Because $\langle \mathbb{Q}^N, 1\rangle = 1$, for each N, we can assume that $H \geq 1$. Moreover, there exist two subsequences $(\mathbb{Q}^{1,N})_N$ and $(\mathbb{Q}^{2,N})_N$ of $(\mathbb{Q}^N)_N$ such that the limits

$$y_1 = \lim_N \langle \mathbb{Q}^{1,N}, H\rangle \text{ and } y_2 = \lim_N \langle \mathbb{Q}^{2,N}, H\rangle \text{ exist with } y_1 \neq y_2. \tag{5.2}$$

With H as above, we define $B := 1/H$ and a new stock price process with increments

$$\Delta \tilde{S} := B\, \Delta S,$$

and then consider the log-utility maximization problem with the random endowment B and the stock-price increments $\Delta\tilde{S}$. The associated dual problem[1] is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{v}(y) &:= \inf_{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}} \mathbb{E}[V(y\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}}{d\mathbb{P}})] + y\langle \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}, B\rangle \\
&= -1 + \inf_{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}} \Big(\mathbb{E}[-\log(y\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}}{d\mathbb{P}})] + y\langle \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}, B\rangle \Big) \\
&= -1 + \mathbb{E}[\log(B)] + \inf_{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}} \Big(\mathbb{E}[-\log(y\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}}{d\mathbb{P}}B)] + y\langle \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}B, 1\rangle \Big) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\log(B)] + \inf_{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}} \Big(\mathbb{E}[V(y\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}}{d\mathbb{P}}B)] + y\langle \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}B, 1\rangle \Big), \quad y > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} := \{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}} \in \ell^1_+ \,:\, \langle \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}, \Delta\tilde{S}\rangle = 0\} \text{ and } \tilde{\mathcal{M}} := \{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}} \,:\, \langle \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}, 1\rangle = 1\}.$$

Because $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ if and only if $\mathbb{Q} = \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}B \in \mathcal{Q}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{y>0} \tilde{v}(y) &= \mathbb{E}[\log(B)] + \inf_{y>0} \inf_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}} \Big(\mathbb{E}[V(y\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}})] + y \Big) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\log(B)] + \inf_{y>0} \Big(v(y) + y \Big) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\log(B)] + \inf_{y>0} \Big(V(y) + y + v^* \Big) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\log(B)] + v^*.
\end{aligned}$$

By using the minimizing sequences $(\mathbb{Q}^{1,N})_N$, and $(\mathbb{Q}^{2,N})_N$ constructed above we define the sequence of probability measures

$$\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{i,N} := \frac{\mathbb{Q}^{i,N}H}{\langle \mathbb{Q}^{i,N}H, 1\rangle} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}} \text{ for } i = 1, 2.$$

[1] It has been shown in [20, Lemma 3.12] that under the reasonable asymptotic elasticity condition, infimization over the set of countably-additive martingale measures - as opposed to its finitely-additive enlargement as in [4] - leads to the same value function.

We can use (5.2) and the fact that $(\mathbb{Q}^{i,N})_N$, $i = 1, 2$, are minimizing sequences for v^* to see

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[V(y_i\tfrac{d\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{i,N}}{d\mathbb{P}})] + y_i\langle\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{i,N}, B\rangle &= \mathbb{E}[V(\tfrac{y_iH}{\langle\mathbb{Q}^{i,N}H,1\rangle}\tfrac{d\mathbb{Q}^{i,N}}{d\mathbb{P}})] + \tfrac{y_i}{\langle\mathbb{Q}^{i,N}H,1\rangle}\\ &= \mathbb{E}[V(\tfrac{y_iH}{\langle\mathbb{Q}^{i,N}H,1\rangle})] + \tfrac{y_i}{\langle q^{i,N}H,1\rangle} - \mathbb{E}[\log(\tfrac{d\mathbb{Q}^{i,N}}{d\mathbb{P}})]\\ &\to \mathbb{E}[\log(B)] + v^*\\ &= \inf_{y>0}\tilde{v}(y).\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\tilde{v}(y_i) \geq \inf_{y>0}\tilde{v}(y)$, for $i = 1, 2$, which implies that $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{i,N}$ is a minimizing sequence for $\tilde{v}(y_i)$. Therefore, $\tilde{v}(y_1) = \tilde{v}(y_2) = \inf_{y>0}\tilde{v}(y)$ which implies that $\tilde{v}$ is constant on $[y_1, y_2]$. This, in turn implies, that the conjugate function to $\tilde{v}$ fails to be differentiable at 0 (indeed, the entire segment $[y_1, y_2]$ belongs to its superdifferential at zero). □

Remark 5.2.

(1) The construction of the random endowment B in Example 5.1 above rests on the weak sequentially completeness property of ℓ^1 which, in fact, holds for any $\mathbb{L}^1$-space. Example 5.1 above is therefore generic in the sense that it can be applied to any model which produces non-trivial singular components in the dual optimizer for the log-investor (with constant endowment). This implies that there also exist random endowments in the Brownian setting of Example 5.1 in [16] which produce a non-differentiable primal utility function.

(2) Example 5.1 seems to contradict the claimed smoothness of the primal value function stated in Theorem 3.1(i) in [4][2]: With the notation from Example 5.1 we can define the primal utility value function

$$\tilde{u}(x) := \sup_{\pi\in\mathbb{R}}\mathbb{E}[U(x + \pi\Delta\tilde{S} + B)], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{5.3}$$

where we use the convention $\mathbb{E}[U(x + \pi\Delta\tilde{S} + B)] = -\infty$ if $\mathbb{E}[U(x + \pi\Delta\tilde{S} + B)^-] = +\infty$. Then $\tilde{u}$ is not differentiable at $x = 0$ which is an interior point in $\tilde{u}$'s domain.

5.2. **A characterization via a linear stochastic control problem.** Even though the superdifferential of $\mathfrak{U}$ at B consists of finitely-additive measures related to the solution of the dual problem, it is possible to give a characterization of directional derivatives without any recourse to finite additivity. This is the most attractive feature of our linear characterization in Proposition 5.5 below; however, as we shall see later, it also leads to explicit computations in many cases. The price we pay is the increased complexity of the linearized problem's domain.

[2]The authors first learned from Pietro Siorpaes about the potential lack of correctness of Remark 4.2 in [4].

Throughout the reminder of the paper we impose the following assumption, where $\hat{X}$ is the primal optimizer characterized by (4.5), and whose existence is guaranteed by the assumption of reasonable elasticity:

Assumption 5.3. U is reasonably elastic and there exists a constant $b > 0$ such that

$$\hat{X}\, U'\Big((1-b)\hat{X}\Big) \in \mathbb{L}^1(\mathbb{P}). \tag{5.4}$$

Remark 5.4. Assumption 5.3 holds automatically if, for example, U belongs to the class of CRRA (power) utilities

$$U(x) = \tfrac{x^p}{p}, \text{ for } p \in (-\infty, 1) \setminus \{0\} \text{ or } U(x) = \log(x).$$

Given the optimizer $\hat{\pi} \in \mathcal{A}$ and the random variable $\hat{X}$, we let $\Delta(\varphi) := \cup_{\varepsilon>0}\Delta^{\varepsilon}(\varphi)$ where $\Delta^{\varepsilon}(\varphi)$ denotes the class of all $\delta \in L(S)$, such that

$$\hat{\pi} + \varepsilon\delta \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } \hat{X} + \varepsilon(\varphi + (\delta \cdot S)_T) \geq 0. \tag{5.5}$$

Because $\mathcal{A}$ is a convex cone and $\hat{X} \geq 0$, the family $\Delta^{\varepsilon}(\varphi)$ is nonincreasing in $\varepsilon \geq 0$ in the sense

$$\varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_2 \Rightarrow \Delta^{\varepsilon_2}(\varphi) \subseteq \Delta^{\varepsilon_1}(\varphi). \tag{5.6}$$

Similarly, the family $\Delta^{\varepsilon}(\varphi)$ is nondecreasing in $\varphi \in \mathbb{L}^{\infty}$ in the sense

$$\varphi_1 \leq \varphi_2 \Rightarrow \Delta^{\varepsilon}(\varphi_1) \subseteq \Delta^{\varepsilon}(\varphi_2). \tag{5.7}$$

Proposition 5.5. *Under Assumption 5.3 we have for* $\varphi \in \mathbb{L}^{\infty}(\mathbb{P})$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\left(\mathfrak{U}(B+\varepsilon\varphi) - \mathfrak{U}(B)\right) = \sup_{\delta \in \Delta(\varphi)} \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}\big((\delta \cdot S)_T + \varphi\big)], \tag{5.8}$$

where $\hat{Y} := \frac{d\hat{\mu}^r}{d\mathbb{P}}$.

Proof. For small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find $\pi^{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $X^{\varepsilon} = (\pi^{\varepsilon} \cdot S)_T + B + \varepsilon\varphi$ has the property that

$$\mathbb{E}[U(X_T^{\varepsilon})] \geq \mathfrak{U}(B + \varepsilon\varphi) - \varepsilon^2.$$

For such an $\varepsilon > 0$ we define

$$\delta^{\varepsilon} = \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\Big(\pi^{\varepsilon} - \hat{\pi}\Big).$$

Since $\hat{\pi} + \varepsilon\delta^{\varepsilon} = \pi^{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{A}$, the first part of (5.5) above holds. To see that the second part of (5.5) holds, we note that $\hat{X} + \varepsilon\big((\delta^{\varepsilon} \cdot S)_T + \varphi\big) = X^{\varepsilon}$ and $\mathbb{E}[U(X^{\varepsilon})] > -\infty$ which implies $\hat{X} + \varepsilon\big((\delta^{\varepsilon} \cdot S)_T + \varphi\big) \geq 0$. Therefore, we have

$\delta^\varepsilon \in \Delta^\varepsilon(\varphi)$. The concavity of $\mathfrak{U}$ then implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{U}(B+\varepsilon\varphi) &\leq \mathbb{E}[U(X^\varepsilon)] + \varepsilon^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[U(\hat{X})] + \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[U'(\hat{X})(\varphi + (\delta^\varepsilon \cdot S)_T)] + \varepsilon^2 \\ &\leq \mathfrak{U}(B) + \varepsilon \sup_{\delta\in\Delta^\varepsilon(\varphi)} \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}((\delta\cdot S)_T + \varphi)] + \varepsilon^2 \\ &\leq \mathfrak{U}(B) + \varepsilon \sup_{\delta\in\Delta(\varphi)} \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}((\delta\cdot S)_T + \varphi)] + \varepsilon^2.\end{aligned}$$

This produces the upper bound inequality

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\searrow 0} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\Big(\mathfrak{U}(B+\varepsilon\varphi) - \mathfrak{U}(B)\Big) \leq \sup_{\delta\in\Delta(\varphi)} \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}((\delta\cdot S)_T + \varphi)].$$

To prove the opposite inequality, we pick $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\delta \in \Delta^{\varepsilon_0}(\varphi)$, so that $\hat{\pi} + \varepsilon_0\delta \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\hat{X} + \varepsilon_0 D \geq 0$, where

$$D = (\delta\cdot S)_T + \varphi.$$

Because $b > 0$, we also have

$$\hat{X} + b\varepsilon_0 D \geq (1-b)\hat{X}.$$

Therefore, for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$ with $\varepsilon_1 := b\varepsilon_0$ we have

$$\hat{X} + \varepsilon D \geq (1-b)\hat{X} > 0. \tag{5.9}$$

The concavity of U implies that for $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_1)$ we have

$$U(\hat{X}+\varepsilon D) \geq U(\hat{X}) + \varepsilon Y^\varepsilon D \text{ where } Y^\varepsilon = U'\Big(\hat{X}+\varepsilon D\Big).$$

Therefore, for $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_1)$ we obtain

$$\mathfrak{U}(B+\varepsilon\varphi) \geq \mathbb{E}[U(\hat{X}+\varepsilon D)] \geq \mathfrak{U}(B) + \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[Y^\varepsilon D].$$

In order to pass ε to zero we note that (5.9) gives us

$$\Big(Y^\varepsilon D\Big)^- \leq U'\big((1-b)\hat{X}\big)D^- \leq U'\big((1-b)\hat{X}\big)\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon_0}\hat{X}, \tag{5.10}$$

which is integrable by assumption. The uniform bound in (5.10) allows us to use Fatou's lemma together with $Y^\varepsilon \to U'(\hat{X}) =: \hat{Y}$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., to conclude that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\searrow 0} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\Big(\mathfrak{U}(B+\varepsilon\varphi) - \mathfrak{U}(\varphi)\Big) \geq \liminf_{\varepsilon\searrow 0} \mathbb{E}[Y^\varepsilon D] \geq \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}D]. \qquad \square$$

The following example highlights the role strict local martingales play in the linear optimization problem appearing in (5.8). The next section identifies the key components which make this toy example work.

Example 5.6. Let us consider the setting of Example 1 in Section 2 but with a constant payoff φ and unit initial wealth $\hat{X}_0 = 1$ (which implies that $\hat{Y}_0 = 1$). From Remark 3.2 in [12] we know that the unique Davis price is φ itself which is different from $\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}_T\varphi]$.

In this setting we have for $\delta \in \Delta^{\varepsilon}(\varphi)$ the property

$$(\delta \cdot S)_t \geq -\varphi - \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\hat{X}_t, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

Because of the log-investor's myopic property $\hat{Y}\hat{X} = 1$, we then see that the local martingale $\hat{Y}_t\big((\delta \cdot S)_t + \varphi\big)$ is a lower bounded by $-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$; hence, is a supermartingale. Therefore, the derivative in (5.8) is bounded from above by

$$\sup_{\delta \in \Delta(\varphi)} \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}_T\big((\delta \cdot S)_T + \varphi\big)] \leq \varphi. \tag{5.11}$$

Because $\hat{Y}$ is a strict local martingale, we see that any $\delta \in \Delta(\varphi)$ for which the local martingale $\hat{Y}_t(\delta \cdot S)_t$ is a martingale cannot produce the upper bound in (5.11). On the other hand, any $\delta \in \Delta(\varphi)$ which satisfies the requirement

$$\hat{Y}_T(\delta \cdot S)_T = \varphi(\hat{Y}\lambda \cdot Z)_T$$

attains the upper bound in (5.11). Here λ is the market price of risk process and Z is a Brownian motion (see Example 1 in Section 2 for details). □

6. Uniquely superreplicable random variables

While the linear control problem of Proposition 5.5 provides a useful characterization of $\mathfrak{U}$'s directional derivatives, the linear problem seems to be difficult to solve explicitly in full generality. The present section outlines a relevant class of payoffs φ for which such a tractable solution is, indeed, available. It involves the notion of unique superreplicability similar to Condition (B1) in [19].

Definition 6.1. A random variable $\psi \in \mathbb{L}^{\infty}(\mathbb{P})$ is said to be

(1) **replicable** if there exists a constant $\psi_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\pi_\psi \in \mathcal{A} \cap (-\mathcal{A})$ such that
$$\psi = \psi_0 + (\pi_\psi \cdot S)_T.$$
(2) **uniquely superreplicable (by Ψ)** if $\Psi \in \mathbb{L}^{\infty}(\mathbb{P})$ is replicable, $\Psi \geq \psi$, and
$$x + (\pi \cdot S)_T \geq \psi \Rightarrow x + (\pi \cdot S)_T \geq \Psi$$
for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$.

Remark 6.2.

(1) The need to use uniformly bounded gains processes for replication purposes such as in Definition 6.1(1) has long been recognized; see, e.g., Definition 1.15 in [23] and the first part of Remark 3.2 in [12].
(2) The representation in Definition 6.1(1) of a replicable claim ψ in terms of (ψ_0, π_ψ) is unique. Moreover, the process $(\pi_\psi \cdot S)_t$ is a bounded $\mathbb{Q}$-martingale for each $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}$. Consequently, because

each $\mu \in \mathcal{D}$ is the weak* limit of a net $y_\alpha \mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ with $y_\alpha \in [0,\infty)$ and $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$, we have

$$\langle \mu, (\pi_\psi \cdot S)_t \rangle = \lim_\alpha y_\alpha \langle \mathbb{Q}_\alpha, (\pi_\psi \cdot S)_t \rangle = 0.$$

(3) Provided it exists, the random variable Ψ in Definition 6.1(2) is unique. If $\Psi = \Psi_0 + (\pi_\Psi \cdot S)_T$ uniquely superreplicates ψ, we have the representation

$$\Psi_0 = \sup_{\mathbb{Q}\in\mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\psi].$$

(4) Unique superreplicability is scale invariant: If ψ is uniquely superreplicable by Ψ, then $\alpha\psi$ is uniquely superreplicable by $\alpha\Psi$ for $\alpha \geq 0$. It is also invariant under translation by replicable random variables. In particular, replicable random variables are uniquely superreplicable.

The following example of uniquely superreplicable random variables was used in Section 2:

Example 6.3. In the setting of Section 2 where (Z, W) are two independent Brownian motions, the payoff $\varphi(W_T)$ for a non-constant bounded continuous function is uniquely superreplicable by the constant $\overline{\varphi} := \sup_a \varphi(a)$. To see this, we note that $x + (\pi \cdot S)_T \geq \varphi(W_T)$ implies for $0 \leq t < T$

$$\begin{aligned} x + (\pi \cdot S)_t &\geq \sup_{\mathbb{Q}\in\mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[x + (\pi \cdot S)_T | \mathcal{F}_t] \\ &\geq \sup_{\mathbb{Q}\in\mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\varphi(W_T)|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= \overline{\varphi}. \end{aligned}$$

We can then pass $t \uparrow T$ and use the continuity of S to see that the implication in Definition 6.1(2) holds. □

The next example shows that it is quite easy to construct bounded payoffs ψ which fail to be uniquely superreplicable.

Example 6.4. We consider the following one period model with three states:

$$\Delta S := (1, 0, -1)', \quad \psi := (-1, 0, -1)'.$$

The set of pairs (x, π) for which $x + \pi\Delta S \geq \psi$ is given by $x \geq 0$ and $\pi \in [-1 - x, 1 + x]$. However, the corresponding set of gain outcomes $(x + \pi, x, x - \pi)'$ with $x \geq 0$ and $\pi \in [-1 - x, 1 + x]$ does not contain a smallest element. Indeed, if (a, b, c) is a smallest element, we would have $a \leq -1, b \leq 0$, and $c \leq -1$ but such an element (a, b, c) is not the outcome of any gains process $x + \pi\Delta S$ with $x \geq 0$ and $\pi \in [-1 - x, 1 + x]$. □

The main technical result of this section is the following proposition:

Proposition 6.5. *Under Assumption 5.3, suppose that $-B$ and $-(B+\varepsilon\varphi)$ are uniquely superreplicable by $-\underline{B}$ and $-(\underline{B+\varepsilon\varphi})$, respectively, for all $\varepsilon>0$ in some neighborhood of 0. Then, for each $\hat{\mu}\in\hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\searrow 0}\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\Big(\mathfrak{U}(B+\varepsilon\varphi)-\mathfrak{U}(B)\Big)=\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}\varphi]+\lim_{\varepsilon\searrow 0}\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\Big\langle\hat{\mu}^s,\underline{B+\varepsilon\varphi}-\underline{B}\Big\rangle, \tag{6.1}$$

where $\hat{Y}=\frac{d\hat{\mu}^r}{d\mathbb{P}}$.

Proof. For $\varepsilon>0$ we let x_ε, $x_0\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\pi_\varepsilon,\pi_0\in\mathcal{A}\cap(-\mathcal{A})$ be such that

$$\underline{B+\varepsilon\varphi}=\varepsilon x_\varepsilon+\varepsilon\,(\pi_\varepsilon\cdot S)_T \text{ and } \underline{B}=x_0+(\pi_0\cdot S)_T\,.$$

Because B is bounded away from zero and $\varphi\in\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ we can consider $\varepsilon>0$ so small that $x_\varepsilon,x_0>0$. For $\delta\in\Delta^\varepsilon(\varphi)$ we have $\varepsilon\delta+\hat{\pi}\in\mathcal{A}$ and

$$\varepsilon(\delta\cdot S)_T+(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T\geq-\varepsilon\varphi-B.$$

Therefore, by the unique superreplicability of $\underline{B+\varepsilon\varphi}$, we have

$$0\leq x_\varepsilon+(\delta\cdot S)_T+\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T+(\pi_\varepsilon\cdot S)_T\,. \tag{6.2}$$

Since $\underline{B}$ uniquely superreplicates B we have $\underline{B}+(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T\geq 0$. Therefore, for any $\hat{\mu}\in\hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$, the first part of Equation (4.7) in [4] produces

$$0\leq\langle\hat{\mu}^s,\underline{B}+(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T\rangle\leq\langle\hat{\mu}^s,B+(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T\rangle=0. \tag{6.3}$$

The second part of Equation (4.7) in [4] ensures $\langle\hat{\mu},(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T\rangle=0$ and combining this with $\langle\hat{\mu}^s,\underline{B}+(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T\rangle=0$ we see

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\hat{\mu}^r,\underline{B}+(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T\rangle&=\langle\hat{\mu},\underline{B}+(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T\rangle\\&=\langle\hat{\mu},\underline{B}\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Because $\hat{Y}=\frac{d\hat{\mu}^r}{d\mathbb{P}}$ we obtain the representation

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T]=\langle\hat{\mu}^s,\underline{B}\rangle. \tag{6.4}$$

The property $\varepsilon\delta+\hat{\pi}\in\mathcal{A}$ produces $\langle\hat{\mu},\varepsilon(\delta\cdot S)_T+(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T\rangle\leq 0$ and $\langle\hat{\mu},(\pi_\varepsilon\cdot S)_T\rangle=0$, for each $\varepsilon>0$. Therefore, by (6.2), we find

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}(x_\varepsilon+(\pi_\varepsilon\cdot S)_T+(\delta\cdot S)_T+\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T)]\\&\leq\langle\hat{\mu},x_\varepsilon+(\pi_\varepsilon\cdot S)_T+(\delta\cdot S)_T+\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T\rangle\\&\leq\langle\hat{\mu},x_\varepsilon\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

To show that the upper bound in (6.5) above is attained we pick

$$\delta_\varepsilon=(\tfrac{x_\varepsilon}{x_0}-\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon})\hat{\pi}+\tfrac{x_\varepsilon}{x_0}\pi_0-\pi_\varepsilon. \tag{6.6}$$

Because $x_\varepsilon > 0$ and $x_0 > 0$ one can check that $\delta_\varepsilon \in \Delta^\varepsilon(\varphi)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}(x_\varepsilon + (\pi_\varepsilon \cdot S)_T + (\delta_\varepsilon \cdot S)_T + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}(\hat{\pi} \cdot S)_T)] \\
&\quad = \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}(x_\varepsilon + \tfrac{x_\varepsilon}{x_0}((\hat{\pi} + \pi_0) \cdot S)_T)] \\
&\quad = \tfrac{x_\varepsilon}{x_0}\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}(\underline{B} + (\hat{\pi} \cdot S)_T)] \\
&\quad = \tfrac{x_\varepsilon}{x_0}\langle \hat{\mu}, \underline{B} + (\hat{\pi} \cdot S)_T \rangle \\
&\quad = \langle \hat{\mu}, x_\varepsilon \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from $\langle \hat{\mu}, \underline{B} \rangle = \langle \hat{\mu}, x_0 \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{\mu}, (\hat{\pi} \cdot S)_T \rangle = 0$. Therefore, δ_ε indeed attains the upper bound of (6.5), and, so,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\delta \in \Delta^\varepsilon(\varphi)} \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}((\delta \cdot S)_T + \varphi)] = \\
&\quad = \langle \hat{\mu}, x_\varepsilon \rangle - \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}(\underline{B + \varepsilon\varphi})] - \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}(\hat{\pi} \cdot S)_T] + \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}\varphi] \\
&\quad = \langle \hat{\mu}^r, \varphi \rangle + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\langle \hat{\mu}^s, \underline{B + \varepsilon\varphi} - \underline{B} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

The sets $\Delta^\varepsilon(\varphi)$ monotonically increase to $\Delta(\varphi)$ as $\epsilon \searrow 0$. This implies

$$\sup_{\delta \in \Delta^\varepsilon(\varphi)} \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}((\delta \cdot S)_T + \varphi)] \nearrow \sup_{\delta \in \Delta(\varphi)} \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}((\delta \cdot S)_T + \varphi)] \tag{6.7}$$

as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$. Because the left-hand-side of (6.7) equals $\langle \hat{\mu}^r, \varphi \rangle + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\langle \hat{\mu}^s, \underline{B + \varepsilon\varphi} - \underline{B} \rangle$, we see that (6.1) holds by Proposition 5.5. □

A first consequence of Proposition 6.5 is that the situation encountered in Example 5.1 cannot happen if $-B$ if uniquely superreplicable. Indeed, the primal value function $\mathfrak{U}$ is then smooth in all replicable directions:

Corollary 6.6. *Suppose that Assumption 5.3 holds, that $-B$ is uniquely superreplicable and that φ is replicable. Then the following two-sided limit exists*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\Big(\mathfrak{U}(B + \varepsilon\varphi) - \mathfrak{U}(B)\Big) = \langle \hat{\mu}, \varphi \rangle \text{ for each } \hat{\mu} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B). \tag{6.8}$$

In particular, there exists a constant $y_B > 0$ such that

$$y_B = \hat{\mu}(\Omega) \text{ for each } \hat{\mu} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B).$$

Proof. First observe that for replicable φ we have $\underline{B + \varepsilon\varphi} = \underline{B} + \varepsilon\varphi$. Then we can apply Proposition 6.5 to both φ and $-\varphi$ to see (6.8). The last claim follows by setting $\varphi = 1$. □

Now that we know that all dual minimizers $\hat{\mu} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$ have the same total mass, the following result follows directly from Corollary 4.6 above.

Corollary 6.7. *Suppose that Assumption 5.3 holds and that $-B$ is uniquely superreplicable. Then each replicable $\varphi \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ has the unique B-conditionally Davis price $\langle \hat{\mu}, \varphi \rangle / \hat{\mu}(\Omega)$.*

When B is a constant (and more generally, when B is replicable), it is known that the product of the primal and dual optimizers is a martingale (see, e.g., the discussion on p.911-2 in [16]). When the dual optimizer is only a finitely-additive measure, the following corollary may serve as a surrogate. The result relies on [15] where a positive supermartingale deflator $\{\hat{Y}_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ is constructed from $\hat{\mu} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$ (see Equation 2.5 in [15]).

Corollary 6.8. *Suppose that Assumption 5.3 holds, that $-B$ is uniquely superreplicable by $-\underline{B}$, and write*

$$\underline{B} = x_0 + (\pi_0 \cdot S)_T.$$

Then the process

$$\hat{Y}_t\Big(x_0 + \big((\pi_0 + \hat{\pi}) \cdot S\big)_t\Big), \quad t \in [0,T],$$

is a nonnegative martingale where $\{\hat{Y}_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ is the supermartingale deflator corresponding to $\hat{\mu} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$.

Proof. From Theorem 2.10 in [15] we know that the process in question is a nonnegative supermartingale. Furthermore, also from [15], we have $\hat{Y}_T = \frac{d\mu^r}{d\mathbb{P}}$ and $\hat{Y}_0 \leq \hat{\mu}(\Omega)$. To obtain the constant expectation property we use (6.3) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \hat{\mu}, x_0\rangle &= \langle \hat{\mu}, (\hat{\pi} \cdot S)_T + \underline{B}\rangle = \langle \hat{\mu}^r, (\hat{\pi} \cdot S)_T + \underline{B}\rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\hat{Y}_T\big((\hat{\pi} \cdot S)_T + \underline{B}\big)\right] \leq \hat{Y}_0 x_0 \leq \hat{\mu}(\Omega) x_0,\end{aligned}$$

and the claimed martingale property follows. □

We conclude this section by providing a first-order approximation (right limit) to the primal utility maximizer in the Brownian setting used in Section 2's examples as well as in Example 6.3. One gets the left limit corrector by applying the result to $-\varphi$. As preparation, we pick two bounded continuous functions $\varphi_0, \varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and define

$$\underline{\varphi}(\varepsilon) := \inf_{a\in\mathbb{R}} \Big(\varphi_0(a) + \varepsilon\varphi(a)\Big), \quad \varepsilon \geq 0.$$

We note that $\underline{\varphi}$ is concave and admits a right derivative at 0 which satisfies $|\underline{\varphi}'(0+)| \leq \sup_{a\in\mathbb{R}} |\varphi(a)|$.

Corollary 6.9. *Consider the Brownian setting of Section 2 and suppose that Assumption 5.3 holds for $B := \varphi_0(W_T)$. Then the process*

$$(1 + \varepsilon\tfrac{\underline{\varphi}'(0+)}{\underline{\varphi}(0)})\hat{\pi}$$

is first-order optimal in the sense that

$$\mathfrak{U}\big(B + \varepsilon\varphi(W_T)\big) - \mathbb{E}\left[U\Big(\big(1 + \varepsilon\tfrac{\underline{\varphi}'(0+)}{\underline{\varphi}(0)}\big)(\hat{\pi} \cdot S)_T + B + \varepsilon\varphi(W_T)\Big)\right] \in o(\varepsilon)$$

as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$.

Proof. We let δ^ε be defined by (6.6), i.e., $\delta^\varepsilon_t := \frac{1}{\underline{\varphi}(0)}\frac{\underline{\varphi}(\varepsilon)-\underline{\varphi}(0)}{\varepsilon}\hat{\pi}_t$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\delta\in\Delta(\varphi)}\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}(\delta\cdot S)_T] &= \lim_{\varepsilon\searrow 0}\mathbb{E}\Big[\hat{Y}(\delta^\varepsilon\cdot S)_T\Big]\\ &= \tfrac{\underline{\varphi}'(0+)}{\underline{\varphi}(0)}\mathbb{E}\Big[\hat{Y}(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T\Big] = \underline{\varphi}'(0+)\hat{\mu}^s(\Omega),\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses (6.4). We can then re-use the proof of Proposition 5.5 to see

$$\mathbb{E}\left[U\Big(\big(1+\varepsilon\tfrac{\underline{\varphi}'(0+)}{\underline{\varphi}(0)}\big)(\hat{\pi}\cdot S)_T + B + \varepsilon\varphi\big(W_T\big)\Big)\right] - \mathfrak{U}\big(B\big) - \varepsilon\Delta \in o(\varepsilon),$$

as $\varepsilon\searrow 0$ where we have defined

$$\Delta := \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}\varphi] + \underline{\varphi}'(0+)\hat{\mu}^s(\Omega).$$

It remains to apply the triangle inequality and Proposition 6.5. □

7. The interval of Conditional Davis prices

This section closes the loop and gives an explicit expression for the interval of conditional Davis prices under the assumption of unique superreplicability. We start with a standard characterization of Davis prices in terms of perturbed value functions. Given $B\in\mathbb{L}^\infty_{++}$ and $\varphi\in\mathbb{L}^\infty$ (we do not impose any unique superreplicability assumption on either, yet). We let the function $u:\mathbb{R}^2\to[-\infty,\infty)$ be defined by

$$u(\varepsilon,x) := \mathfrak{U}(B+x+\varepsilon\varphi),$$

and let its supergradient at $(0,0)$ be denoted by $\partial u(0,0)$.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\varphi\in\mathbb{L}^\infty$. If $(0,0)\in\partial u(0,0)$, then $P(\varphi|B)=\mathbb{R}$. Otherwise,*

$$P(\varphi|B) = \{\delta/y\,:\,y\neq 0, (\delta,y)\in\partial u(0,0)\}.$$

Proof. Thanks to the assumption that $B\in\mathbb{L}^\infty_{++}$, u is concave and finite-valued in some neighborhood of $(0,0)$. Moreover Definition 4.4 translates into the following statement:

$$p\in P(\varphi|B) \text{ if and only if } u(0,0)\geq u(\varepsilon,-\varepsilon p) \text{ for all } \varepsilon.$$

By concavity, this is equivalent to the nonpositivity of the directional derivative of u, at $(0,0)$ in the directions $(-1,p)$ and $(1,-p)$, i.e.

$$\inf_{(\delta,y)\in\partial u(0,0)} -\delta+py\leq 0 \;\text{ and }\; \inf_{(\delta,y)\in\partial u(0,0)}\delta-py\leq 0.$$

By the convexity of the supergradient, this is equivalent to existence of a pair $(\delta,y)\in\partial u(0,0)$ such that $py=\delta$. □

Theorem 7.2. *Suppose that Assumption 5.3 holds and that $-B$ and $-(B+\varepsilon\varphi)$ are uniquely superreplicable by $-\underline{B}$ and $-(\underline{B+\varepsilon\varphi})$, respectively, for all ε in some neighborhood of 0. The interval of $\overline{B}$-Davis prices of φ is given by*

$$\frac{1}{y_B}\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}\varphi] + \frac{1}{y_B}\Big[\lim_{\varepsilon\searrow 0}\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\Big\langle\hat{\mu}^s, \underline{B+\varepsilon\varphi} - \underline{B}\Big\rangle, \lim_{\varepsilon\nearrow 0}\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\Big\langle\hat{\mu}^s, \underline{B+\varepsilon\varphi} - \underline{B}\Big\rangle\Big], \tag{7.1}$$

where y_B is the common value of $\hat{\mu}(\Omega)$ for all $\hat{\mu}\in\hat{\mathcal{D}}(B)$.

Proof. By Corollary 6.6, the function u is differentiable in x at $x=0$, with derivative y_B. The interval of B-conditional Davis prices, according to Lemma 7.1, is given by

$$\tfrac{1}{y_B}[\partial_{\varepsilon+}u(0,0), \partial_{\varepsilon-}u(0,0)].$$

This, in turn, coincides with the expression in (7.1) thanks to Proposition 6.5. □

We conclude by showing how to use Theorem 7.2 to obtain the formulas stated in Section 2's examples. In the Brownian setting of Section 2 we have $B+\varepsilon\varphi = \varphi_0(W_T)+\varepsilon\varphi(W_T)$ for two bounded and continuous functions $\varphi_0, \varphi : \mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$. Example 6.3 shows that

$$\underline{B+\varepsilon\varphi} = \underline{\varphi}(\varepsilon), \quad \underline{B} = \underline{\varphi}(0), \text{ where } \underline{\varphi}(\varepsilon) := \inf_{a\in\mathbb{R}}\Big(\varphi_0(a)+\varepsilon\varphi(a)\Big), \quad \varepsilon\geq 0.$$

In this case, the limit describing the lower end-point in (7.1) can be computed as follows

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\searrow 0}\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\Big\langle\hat{\mu}^s, \underline{B+\varepsilon\varphi} - \underline{B}\Big\rangle = \Big\langle\hat{\mu}-\hat{\mu}^r, 1\Big\rangle\underline{\varphi}'(0+) = (y_B - \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}])\underline{\varphi}'(0+),$$

where $y_B > 0$ is the constant from Corollary 6.6 (equivalently, if $x > -\underline{\varphi}(0)$ denotes the investor's initial, we have $u'(x) = y_B$). The upper end-point in (7.1) can be computed similarly. Finally, we mention that Corollary 6.9 can be used to provide first-order corrections to the optimal portfolios in Section 2's Brownian based examples.

References

[1] Tomas Björk and Irina Slinko, *Towards a General Theory of Good-Deal Bounds*, Review of Finance **10** (2006), 221–260.

[2] René Carmona, *Indifference Pricing: Theory and Applications*, Princeton Series in Financial Engineering (Princeton), (2009).

[3] John Cochrane and Jesus Saá Requejo, *Beyond arbitrage: Good-deal asset price bounds in incomplete markets*, Journal of Political Economy **108** (2000), 79–119.

[4] Jakša Cvitanić, Walter Schachermayer, and Hui Wang, *Utility maximization in incomplete markets with random endowment*, Finance and Stochastics **5** (2001), 237–259.

[5] Mark Davis, *Option Pricing in Incomplete Markets*, Mathematics of Derivative Securities, M. A. H. Dempster and S. R. Pliska, eds., New York: Cambridge University Press (1997), 216–226.

[6] Freddie Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer, *A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing*, Math. Ann. **300** (1994), 463–520.

[7] Freddie Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer, *The fundamental theorem of asset pricing for unbounded stochastic processes*, Math. Ann. **312** (1998), no. 2, 215–250.
[8] Freddie Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer, *A Simple counterexample to several problems in the theory of asset pricing*, Mathematical Finance, **8** (1998), 1–11.
[9] Nelson Dunford and Jacob T. Schwartz, *Linear operators. Part I*, John Wiley & Sons Inc. (New York), (1988).
[10] Hans Föllmer and Alexander Schied, *Stochastic Finance*, de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics (Berlin), (2004).
[11] Lingqi Gu, Yiqing Lin, and Junjian Yang, *On the dual problem of utility maximization in incomplete markets*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, **126** (2016), 1019–1035.
[12] Julien Hugonnier, Dmitry Kramkov, and Walter Schachermayer, *On utility based pricing of contingent claims in incomplete markets*, Mathematical Finance **15** (2005), no. 2, 203–212.
[13] Ioannis Karatzas and Steven E. Shreve, *Methods of mathematical finance*, Applications of Mathematics (New York), vol. 39, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
[14] Ioannis Karatzas, John Lehoczky, Steven E. Shreve and Gin-Lin Xu, *Martingale and Duality Methods for Utility Maximization in an Incomplete Market*, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **29** (1991), 707–730.
[15] Ioannis Karatzas and Gordan Žitković, *Optimal consumption from investment and random endowment in incomplete semimartingale markets*, Annals of Probability **31** (2003), no. 4, 1821–1858.
[16] Dmitry Kramkov and Walter Schachermayer, *The asymptotic elasticity of utility functions and optimal investment in incomplete markets*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **9** (1999), no. 3, 904–950.
[17] Dmitry Kramkov and Mihai Sirbu, *Sensitivity analysis of utility based prices and risk-tolerance wealth processes*, Annals of Applied Probability **16** (2006), 2140–2194.
[18] Dmitry Kramkov and Kim Weston, *Muckenhoupt's (A_p) condition and the existence of the optimal martingale measure*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications **126** (2016), 2615–2633.
[19] Kasper Larsen, Halil Mete Soner, and Gordan Žitković, *Facelifting in utility maximization*, Finance & Stochastics **20** (2016), 99–121.
[20] Kasper Larsen and Gordan Žitković, *Utility maximization under convex portfolio constraints*, Annals of Applied Probability **23** (2013), no. 2, 665–692.
[21] Kasper Larsen and Gordan Žitković, *Stability of utility-maximization in incomplete markets* , Stochastic Processes and their Applications, **117** (2007), 1642–1662.
[22] Mark Owen and Gordan Žitković, *Optimal Investment with an unbounded random endowment and utility-based pricing*, Mathematical Finance **19** (2009), 129–159.
[23] Albert Shiryaev and Alexander Cherny, *Vector stochastic integrals and the fundamental theorems of asset pricing*, Proceedings of the Steklov Mathematical Institute, **237** (2002), 12–56.
[24] C. Zălinescu, *Convex analysis in general vector spaces*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc., (2002).

Kasper Larsen, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Carnegie Mellon University
E-mail address: kasperl@andrew.cmu.edu

Halil Mete Soner, Department of Mathematics, ETH Zürich
E-mail address: mete.soner@math.ethz.ch

Gordan Žitković, Department of Mathematics, University of Texas at Austin
E-mail address: gordanz@math.utexas.edu